



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

A NOTE ON THE AUGMENT

An article recently published in this Journal (VII, 4) has drawn attention to some difficulties of the augment. Of the points raised not all can be profitably discussed here. In some questions it would be unseemly for me to meddle. For instance, anyone who is dissatisfied with the augment in similes must revise the work of Professor Platt; or if he has his doubts about the iterative, he can correct the grammar of the late Dr. Monro. In other cases, such as the augmentation of the main body of aorists and imperfects, the dispute is beyond the compass of a short paper, where it is impossible to enumerate the examples. Dr. Shewan will agree that in such matters there is no need for haste or alarm. If there are more augments than I made out, they will not run away; if there are fewer, no false examples can now be foisted into the text—that possibility has been past for some centuries. But there are some uses so comparatively rare that their occurrences can be enumerated; where this is so, it will be possible to debate the facts. Sometimes the facts themselves are conceded by Dr. Shewan; here we can reasonably argue the interpretation. In this way discussion may be restricted to four points.

a) The extreme rarity of the temporal augments like that in *ἥσσεν* may be taken as a test case. Clearly, the explanation must be partly metrical. But is the explanation purely metrical? If it is, why are forms like *ὅρουσε* unknown in the similes? Or let us ignore the similes, and suppose that *ὅρουσε* is a purely scansional form, motived by the dislike of spondees. Our troubles then begin all over again. When spondees are fairly caused by the sense of a passage, there is no clear avoidance of them. To take simple instances, closed trochees are often used as spondees (*ταρσὸν δεξιτέρῳ*, || *ταρσὸν ποδός*, etc.); so too, scensions like || *τόν δέ*, || *τοῦ δέ*, etc., seem quite normal. If then the augment in narrative was from the first felt as part of the sense, it is not easy to understand the taboo of *ὅρουσε*. But let this pass, and in spite of forms like *ἔξηγε*, *ἡγεῖτο*, *ἴζεσκε* etc.,¹ let us suppose that spondees of the type *ἥκουσε* were especially offensive. Is it not interesting that these offensive spondees are relatively much commoner in the

¹ The forms are (*Iliad*, narr.) *αἰπεινά*, *ἀμφ'* *αὐτὸν*, *ἀμφέσταν*, *ᾶξοντο*, "Ἄρης, *αὐτὸν*, *ἔξοντο*, *εἰσῆλθε*, *ἔκβαλλε*, *ἔκπαλτο*, *ἔκπιπτον*, *ἐκ τοῦ*, *ἔξαύτις*, *ἔξηγε*, *ἔξηρχε*, (*ἔξικε?*), *ἔμπλητο*, *ἐς μέσον*, *εὐδησ*, *εὐργοσ*, *εὐχοντο*, *ἡβαιν*, *ἡγεῖτο*, *ἥγον δέ*, *ἥντησε*, *ἥρατο*, *ἥρπαξε*, *ἥν τε*, *ἱδρυσε*, *ἴζεσκε*, *ἴζοντο*, *ἱμάστ*, *ἱμερτόν*, *ἱππειον*, (*ἱρισσι*), *ἴσταντο*, *ἴφιμα*, *οὐχνεσκε*, *ὅπλοισιν*, *ὅρσασκεν*, *ὅσσοντο*, *οὐδάσδε*, *οὐτασκε*, *οὐτησε*, *ὑσμῖν*, *ώκτειρε*, *ῷμοιν* (*genit.*); *ῷπλισσε*, *ῷρυντο*, *ῷρμάτο*, *ῷσαιτο*, *ῷσαντο*.

narrative of the *Odyssey*, and that the use becomes so far enfranchised that we actually find scensions like ἡνεκεν || θεράπων? Or if this is still not significant, does it not become so when we find in the *Odyssey* an increasing plenty of other unnecessary spondees? when we find the alternatives in -σ- and -σσ- less exactly handled? when we see spondaic datives in -εσσι (types πάντεσσι and ἀνδρεσσι) going up by leaps and bounds? Does not an inference suggest itself?

b) Tenses with syllabic augment followed by δέ. Dr. Shewan urges the improbability of an amphibrach standing after the weak caesura. Especially for amphibrachs beginning with a vowel the conditions are quite unfavorable—so unfavorable, he says, that we must not be surprised at the non-appearance of || έθηκε δέ or anything of the kind in the whole narrative of the *Iliad*. Very good indeed; τρίδραχμόν γε θούρμήνευμα. But it gives rise to a puzzle; for if type || έθηκε δέ is so reassuringly improbable, why is type || έγειρε δέ so startlingly actual? In the *Iliad* without B², etc.¹ (narr.) there are no less than ten instances—E 496, Z 105, Α 213, P 544, P 552, έγειρε δέ; P 615, ἀμννε δέ; Σ 35, ἀκουσε δέ; N 27, ἄταλλε δέ; O 361, έρειπε δέ; T 386, ἀειρε δέ (add I 189, ρ 216).

Leaving Dr. Shewan and the ungrateful Homer to settle this trifle between themselves, let us look at other instances of the syllabic followed by δέ. The explanation of their rarity is to be this: the aorist followed by δέ comes most often at the beginning of the line; only aorists with two initial consonants can give syllabic augments at the beginning of the line; so we may expect to find that the syllabic followed by δέ is rare even at the beginning of the line. Very good again. But why is the syllabic followed by δέ relatively rare here? Among unaugmented aorists there are in the *Iliad* without B², etc., some 300 starting the line; of these about 160, or 8 in every 15, are followed by δέ. Of augmented aorists in the same position there are 42 instances;² only 6 of these are followed by δέ (add 1 γάρ). Was there not some dislike of the syllabic followed by δέ? The dislike was perhaps slowly weakening; for in the *Odyssey* (narr.), of the 20 augmented aorists³ at the beginning of the line, 10 are followed by δέ (add 1 γάρ). Just for fun, let us take a peep at ι, κ, λ, μ. Here there are 14 augmented aorists starting the verse;⁴ 10 of them are followed by δέ. Homer is so thoughtless in distributing his examples. And there are things of which he will give no

¹ The books B 484-end, Θ, Ι, Κ, Ψ, and Ω are split off from the *Iliad*, and are called for short B², etc.

² Leaving out words like έδραμον and έστάσατο, my list is A 46, B 101, 279, 467, Δ 479, E 83, 108, 309, Z 375, 468, Α 397, 848, M 461, N 339, 520, 543, 608, 677, Ε 179, 392, 452, 519, II 314, 322, 334, 585, 639, 701, P 11, 303, 334, Y 61, 262, 280, 282, 477, Φ 70, 145, 548, 551, 601, X 463.

³ β 427, γ 454, ε 392, 444, η 234, θ 304, 325, ν 55, ξ 34, 50, π 12, σ 97, τ 448, χ 17, 115, 121, 332, ω 102, 392, 441.

⁴ ι 484, 541, κ 97, 148, 220, 310, 397, λ 24, 35, 208, 390, 471, 615, μ 169.

sure narrative examples at all—none of type *ἔβη δ'* (*ἔβαν δ' ἄρα, ἔδν δ' ἄρα μιν* etc.) after the weak caesura, none of types *ἐπάγη δ'*, *ἐπορευ δ'*, *ἐκιον δ' ἄρα*, etc., after the strong. Now look at κ 397 and at π 230. Odd little facts, these. Odd too the chance that type *ἐκέλευσε δέ* standing after the hepthemimeral will always scan the other way about—Γ 259 (*ἐτάρους δὲ κέλευσε*) Δ 584, Ρ 596 (*Δαναοὺς δὲ φόβησε*), Φ 407, ο 547. Γ 381=Y 444 is a shift from *κεκάλυπτο δ' ἄρ'*; and in Φ 389¹ those who care to look can still see the poet either nodding or winking.

c) The aorist with *νῦν*. This is my list:²

- | | | |
|------------|--------------|---|
| I) aug. | 1) certain | a) A 354, 418, B 274, Γ 439, Δ 12, E 882, H 330, Θ 500, I 426, Λ 362, 363, M 271, O 719, P 153, Σ 111, Y 449, 450, Φ 82, X 15? Ω 35, 685, δ 817, 829, ρ 456, 567? ω 259? (cf. A 391). |
| | | β) Ψ 406, β 28. |
| | | γ) A 507, B 240, Δ 179, Θ 370? N 78? 772, Ξ 95, P 173, X 18, α 182, 241, δ 727, θ 330, ι 495, ξ 371, π 223, ρ 524, τ 369 (cf. Λ 663, θ 13). |
| | 2) uncertain | —Γ 405, 415, E 423, Z 338, I 118, 519, Σ 267, 293? Ψ 333, Ω 401, α 43, 194, κ 43, ο 268, 270, π 66, ρ 568, τ 484? χ 29. |
| II) unaug. | 1) certain | —A 445, B 114=Ι 21, Γ 367, K (117), 406, N 453, X 252, Ψ 604, Ω 641, α 36? ζ 172, ι 516, ν 303=π 233. (cf. π 181). |
| | 2) uncertain | —B 82, I 700, K 124, Y 350, Φ 80, δ 209. |

The following are ignored—I), 1), α) E 823, Z 126, Σ 292, 406, X 236, Ω 642, α 235, ε 304; I), 1), γ) I, 344, Λ 279, X 104, ρ 319, ψ 354; I), 2) ψ 55, 225; II), 1) I 344, 0721, Σ 102, Ω 223.

Outside the similes and gnomes there seems to be no use which shows anything like the same degree of augmentation. Can we not infer that it is the meaning of *νῦν* which is the cause here, and that just as a true present sense makes the aug. necessary, so a strong reference to the present makes the aug. desirable? And even if we cling despairingly to *ἔφῆκεν* and *ἀνήκε*, must we not see a difference between the figures for the *Iliad* without B², etc., and those for B², etc., or for the *Odyssey*?

d) The true past aorist in speeches. The issue here has been a little confused by the use of the term “dialogue” of which Dr. Shewan seems to

¹ Pretty clearly a shift from e.g., *στὰς ἐξ Οὐλύμπου, γέλασσε δέ οι*, etc.

² Any corrections or additions would be most thankfully received.

take a view perhaps suggested by the practice of Macaulay or of Nestor. However, let us not be delayed by a discussion of words, but agree simply that the augment is more plentiful in "dialogue." There are three natural ways of looking at this. We may suppose that the augment was a tense-sign—a sign not of past but of present reference. Then since the present-reference tense properly belongs to the speeches, we should expect that these would show more augments. This is the view taken by myself; and it fits the facts very well. But it has a fatal objection; it would establish a difference between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*! In the latter the present-reference tense is perhaps a shade less augmented than in the *Iliad*; but the narrative within the speeches, which in the *Iliad* was still treated very well, now shows a great rise of augmentation. For example, let us split off from the ἀπόλογοι the introduction and the interlude and all the inset speeches: what is left is narrative,¹ and it is a kind of narrative which shows relatively many more augments than the narratives in the speeches of the *Iliad*. Clearly, this will never do. We must try another way of accounting for the augment in speeches. Well, let us suppose that the augment is dramatic. This will suit dialogue very well; but it has the rather awkward consequence that all the aorists in the similes are especially dramatic, while, e.g., in the battle-pieces of Α and of ΙΙ there is a distinct lack of dramatic tenses.² Driven from this, let us last try the hypothesis that the augment has something to do with the first person (as in εμέ). On this view, a narrator speaking of himself ought to use more augments than when speaking of others. This would do perfectly for the ἀπόλογοι, but hardly for some other passages. The similes are as impersonal as anything can very well be; they should have no more right to the augment than plain narrative has. Again, Nestor's great speech³ in Α is faithfully concerned with himself; but the ratio of augmentation approaches that in good narrative, and contrasts—beautifully, I nearly said—with the ἀπόλογοι. Of course it is none of my business, but if I were concerned to defend the Unity, I should not admit statistics, and I should not deny them; I should ignore them. That way, and that way alone, νικᾷ τὸν ἀπαντά λόγον.

The above are four principal points in the theory of the augment. The absence of the augment in type δρουσε is not purely metrical, though the preservation of the type is undoubtedly helped by the meter. In the *Odyssey*

¹ When the ἀπόλογοι are so treated, Dr. Shewan imperturbably calls them dialogue; you see, they have so many augments.

² To suppose that the augmented aorists in narr. are the more dramatic is an experiment worth trying; it gives delightfully comic results.

³ I mean the "dialogue" which distracted Patroclus and drove him to his death. In technical points this is the finest speech in Homer, and no doubt gave a great impetus to such mimetic work, in which Nestor keeps up his reputation as a raconteur, but scansionally and linguistically he degenerates—οὐδὲ δῆρα οἰ τε στόθοι πάρος ζεκεν ἐν γναμπτῆσι γένυσσι.

even this help cannot keep back the tide. The syllabic augment was at first still felt as a compounded element; and a tense so augmented could not well be followed by a conjunction. But at the beginning of the line there is a good deal of pressure to motive this use; the *Iliad* already has some examples (4 out of the 7 are in ΝΞΟ). In the *Odyssey* this use is relatively three times as common; further, a speech-type is thrust into narrative; and a new type appears in the speeches.

As regards the meaning of the augment, we can see that though the prefix was apparently just compatible with past tenses, it was disliked with these; on the metrical evidence the majority of unaugmented forms is very large. This view of the sense is reinforced by the fact that the true present aorist must have the augment; there is also the unsolicited testimonial given by νῶν. In the *Odyssey* the augment with past tenses is rising; the freer use of amphibrachs (type ἔθηκε) is a noticeable point. The old stubbornness of the iteratives is probably due to their special meaning; the treatment of the tense, as of many other things, is conventional in the *Odyssey* where the rule is at last broken. In the speeches, past tenses show a marked rise of augmentation. In many matters, both linguistic and scansional, the speeches, never so exact as narrative, diverge strikingly in the *Odyssey*. An explanation of this fact is badly needed.

Dr. Shewan ends with a perplexing appeal; let me end with a plain avowal. Any case, however good, is generally damaged by overstatement. To avoid this, my reckonings of doubtful points were very often contrived so as to favor the *Odyssey*. For example, elision of the dat. sing. in -ι was not counted as precluding the augment; this helps the *Odyssey*. Dibrachs in -εν (type βάλεν) were not counted as certain, except in the bucolic; this helps the *Odyssey*. The form εἰσε hardly occurs in early work, and it is only in early work that εσσε is demonstrable; the assumption of εσσε helps the *Odyssey*. There is perhaps some evidence to show that compounds were treated differently in the *Odyssey*, which has nothing to gain from any reckoning based on this. The introductions and resumptions of speeches were treated as a distinct class; they are a distinct class, but not so distinct in the *Odyssey*, for that is their home. In many such ways the difference between the two epics was a little covered over. Of course, in my paper there must be blunders and slips and oversights;¹ but they must be luxuriant indeed if the main positions are to be refuted.

J. A. J. DREWITT

WADHAM COLLEGE, OXFORD

¹ Class. *Quar.* VI, 2, p. 111, l. 16, should read “ἐπος φάτο is only found once, v 111 (speech δ 370).”

The narrative imperfect with syllabic augment is followed by δέ five times—P 86, Z 295 =ο 108, ν 255, ψ 369. Of these P 86 presumably stands for ἐκρεε δέ, and this for ἐκ δέ δέ. (*Class.Quar.*, *ibid.*, p. 104).